

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 14 and 16-21 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 15 have been amended.

Election/Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has required that Applicant designate and elect to prosecute one of the inventions that belong to the two identified group of claims as set forth in the Office Action. Applicant confirms the provisional election with traverse made on Aug. 12, 2005 and elects to prosecute the Invention I defined by the Examiner in the Office Action as claims 1-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi et al. (US Patent 6,174,796) in view of Yu et al (US Patent 6,025,259), in further view of Choi (US Patent 6,780,571).

Claim 1

It is Applicant's position that the references fail to disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 1. As amended, claim 1 specifies forming a photo resist sidewall profile angle of "*approximately 30 degrees to approximately 60 degrees.*" claimed in amended claim 1.

Specifically, it is Applicant's position that Takagi fails to disclose a sloping of the photoresist sidewall profile from "approximately 30 degrees to approximately 60 degrees." Although the Examiner cites to Takagi column 4, lines 49-56; Figure 3C as basis for rejection of Applicant's dependant claim 10, it is Applicant's understanding Takagi is referring only to a process of sputtering the corner of the dielectric and not a sloping of the resist to such an angle. Applicant notes that Takagi describes removing the resist *before* inducing any slope (column 4, lines 45-57). Applicant also understands neither the Yu nor the Choi reference to disclose a process whereby resist is sloped from "approximately 30 degrees to approximately 60 degrees."

It is therefore Applicant's position that the cited references in combination do not render the method of Applicant's claim 1 obvious because the limitation that the resist is sloped to "approximately 30 degrees to approximately 60 degrees" is not disclosed by any of the cited

references. Similarly, Applicant understands dependent claims 4-5 are also not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 6

It is Applicant's position that the references also fail to disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 6. Applicant's independent claim 6 has been amended to include a limitation based on original dependent claim 14 whereby the claimed method produces a dielectric sidewall sloping "*from the bond pad surface to the upper end of the opening at an angle of approximately 40 degrees to approximately 50 degrees.*" It is Applicant's understanding the Takagi reference fails to disclose an inclined surface extending *from the bond pad surface to the upper end of the opening* because Takagi merely describes "an inclined surface on an upper peripheral edge of the via hole" (See Takagi, Col. 2, lines: 3-6 referring to Takagi Fig. 2A). Therefore, unlike Applicant's claimed process, the Takagi process does not slope the *entire* sidewall, but merely performs corner rounding along the *upper edge* of the opening. Takagi also fails to disclose that the process be conducted on a bond pad as claimed by Applicant. Applicant also understands neither the Yu nor the Choi reference disclose a process whereby the dielectric is sloped from the bond pad to the upper surface of the opening.

It is therefore Applicant's position that the cited references in combination do not render the method of claim 6 obvious because the limitation that the dielectric opening has a profile sloped "*from the bond pad surface to the upper end of the opening at an angle of approximately 40 degrees to approximately 50 degrees*" is not disclosed by any of the cited references. Similarly, Applicant understands dependent claims 7-15 are also not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

On this basis, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 1-15.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome and the present application is in condition for allowance.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 (a)


Applicant respectfully petitions pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) for a one-month extension of time to file this response to the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005. The extended period is set to expire on December 23, 2005. A check in the amount of \$120.00 is enclosed to cover the fee for a one-month extension of time.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 11/30/05


Michael A. Bernadicou
Reg. No. 35,934

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300